

**MINUTES OF MEETING
REUNION WEST
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Reunion West Community Development District was held on Thursday, **March 14, 2024** at 11:00 a.m. via Zoom Communication Media Technology and at the Heritage Crossing Community Center, 7715 Heritage Crossing Way, Reunion, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum:

Graham Staley	Chairman
Mark Greenstein	Assistant Secretary
William (Bill) Witcher	Assistant Secretary
Michael Barry	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Tricia Adams	District Manager
Kristen Trucco	District Counsel
James Curley	District Engineer
Alan Scheerer	Field Manager
Garrett Huegel	Yellowstone Landscape
John Kingsley	Artemis HOA Manager
Jim Bailoni	President Reunion West Fairways 17 & 18
Residents	

The following is a summary of the discussions and actions taken at the March 14, 2024 Reunion West Community Development District Board of Supervisors meeting.

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Ms. Adams called the meeting to order at 11:01 a.m. and called the roll. All Supervisors were present with the exception of Ms. Harley.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comment Period

There being no comments, the next item followed.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**Approval of the Minutes of the February
8, 2024 Board of Supervisors Meeting**

Ms. Adams presented the minutes of the February 8, 2024 Board of Supervisors meeting, which were included in the agenda package. Mr. Staley requested the following corrections:

- On Page 5 of 14, he stated, *“Mr. Staley was informed that the Sheriff would not come in, if someone was perpetually speeding at 100 miles an hour”* and requested that the sentence, *“Mr. Staley believed that OCSD had no authority to come into the community,”* be deleted.
- One the bottom of Page 5 of 14, the sentence, *“Mr. Staley did not feel that the differences would confuse security or the homeowners and wanted them to be consistent,”* should be *“Mr. Staley did feel that the differences would confuse security or the homeowners and wanted them to be consistent.”*
- Under Field Manager Updates on Page 6 of 14, the second bullet, *“Grand Traverse Parkway”* should be *“Traditions Boulevard”*
- On the bottom of the Page 7 of 14, *“Mr. Scheerer replied affirmatively”* should be *“Mr. Staley replied affirmatively.”*
- On Page 11 of 14, Mr. Staley did not say that he was satisfied with the two or three towings per month. Ms. Adams would change it to say, *“Mr. Staley requested that this be monitored, as he felt that Encore had a more vigorous standard.”*
- On Page 13, the sentence, *“Mr. Staley recalled the POA agreeing that it was the homeowner’s responsibility to power wash and not the CDD’s,”* be deleted, as the POA did not agree.

Mr. Staley questioned whether Ms. Aura Zelada worked for Artemis. Ms. Adams confirmed that Ms. Zelada worked for Artemis and was the Reunion West POA Manager. Ms. Trucco requested on Page 5 of 15, *“Under the Statute, the county was allowed to require an agreement,”* be changed to, *“Ms. Trucco clarified that under the Statute, the county was arguing that they were allowed to require an agreement,”* and that the remainder of the sentence be deleted. Mr. Barry requested, *“A Resident recalled,”* be changed to *“Mr. Barry recalled.”* All corrections would be made to the minutes.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Staley with all in favor the Minutes of the February 8, 2024 Board of Supervisors Meeting were approved as amended.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Discussion of Status of Road Resurfacing Proposals**

Ms. Adams recalled that the District Engineer facilitated a bid for pavement management, based on the scope that the Board approved, which was a result of months of analysis of the current condition of the roadway and identifying priority areas for repairs. The scope also included stop bars and crosswalks as well as optional traffic calming devices, such as speed tables. Unfortunately, there were no responses to the bid and District management staff was conferring with the engineering team, to see if there was an option to potentially piggyback on another government contract in the area. In addition, the District Engineer was also appealing to proposers who received the bid package, but did not respond, to see why they chose not to. Mr. Witcher asked if this was unusual. Ms. Adams confirmed that it was not unusual in this climate, where transportation construction was a priority. She deferred to Mr. Curley, who interacted with the potential proposers. Mr. Curley stated they sent bid packages to six different companies and reminded them of the submittal date and where the proposal was to be submitted, but no one submitted a proposal. Ms. Adams advised staff would review the options the District had, as it was limited due to the public bid process. Mr. Staley felt that asking Mr. Scheerer to fill in the potholes was wise, including the one outside of the water park. Mr. Scheerer confirmed that all of the potholes in the District were filled.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Ratification of Auditing Services Agreement with DiBartolomeo, McBee, Harley & Barnes for Fiscal Years 2024-2028**

Ms. Adams presented an agreement with DiBartolomeo, McBee, Harley & Barnes for auditing services, which was included in the agenda package. The agreement was previously reviewed by District Counsel. This was the firm that was selected by the Audit Committee and was engaged for five years of audit services. Each year, an audit engagement letter would be presented to the Board. The first year, 2024, was \$5,100, \$5,250 for 2025, \$5,475 for 2026, \$5,650 for 2027 and \$5,800 for 2028.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Witcher with all in favor the Auditing Services Agreement with DiBartolomeo, McBee, Harley & Barnes for Fiscal Years 2024-2028 was ratified.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Consideration of Resolution 2024-03
Conveyance of Real Property Tract to
Reunion West Fairways 17 and 18
Association, Inc.**

Ms. Adams presented Resolution 2024-03 for the Conveyance of Real Property Tract to Reunion West Fairways 17 and 18 Association, Inc., which was for an area of the Reunion West CDD, commonly known as Bears Den. When this area was being developed, there was a different intention for Bears Den neighborhood, when compared to other roadways within the District. Most roadways were public, with CDD bond funds being used for construction. Roadways were then owned and maintained by the CDD. However, for the Bears Den roads, no bond funds were used, as they were constructed by the developer and were intended to be private, to allow a stricter form of security and access control. Mr. John Kingsley from Artemis, the HOA Manager for this area, was present as well as Mr. Jim Bailoni, President of Reunion West Fairways 17 & 18. Ms. Adams noted Mr. Kingsley brought this matter to the attention of the CDD. The HOA preferred to establish ownership prior to expending funds to facilitate gate repairs and other work in the right of way. Ms. Trucco thanked Mr. Kingsley for bringing this to their attention, as it should not be owned by the CDD. According to the original plat, it was supposed to be owned and maintained by the developer; however, there was a push many years ago, for all roadways within the CDD, to be transferred to the CDD. But the Development Plan changed and it was clear that this was a private roadway, so staff was comfortable transferring it back to the HOA. Kingwood performed the title work, which was required when property was conveyed from the CDD and Ms. Trucco had no objection to conveying it to the Fairways 17 and 18 Association. Attached to the resolution, was a standard certificate of the District Engineer, certifying that it was consistent with the Development Plan for the CDD, as well as a Quit Claim Deed, deeding every and all rights that the CDD had to this roadway, to the Association. Ms. Trucco received confirmation from Mr. Boyd, that there was no objection, it was the proper conveyance and was waiting for it to be signed and requested the Board's approval of Resolution 2024-03, subject to final execution by the District Engineer.

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****March 14, 2024
Page 5 of 14**

Mr. Staley asked if it included Jack Nicklaus Court, which was parallel to Fairway 18, as the road running along Fairway 17, was already conveyed to the HOA. Ms. Trucco indicated that a map was provided to the Board, from the Property Appraiser's website. Ms. Trucco would verify. Ms. Adams advised that the roadway that was being presented to the Board, was the only one that was identified as being currently owned by the District that needed to be conveyed to the Association. Mr. Staley thanked Ms. Trucco and Mr. Kingsley for doing all of the work. Ms. Trucco reported that she was performing a plat inventory, as there were tracts in the CDDs name that either needed to be conveyed to the CDD or another party, as in the past, cities or counties did not require the CDD to sign off on the Development Plan. Mr. Staley questioned how long the inventory would take. Ms. Trucco anticipated receiving it before the next meeting. Mr. Staley asked if it was feasible to have recommendations at the next meeting or a list of issues that they identified. Ms. Trucco stated there may be a telephone conversation or closed session prior to the next meeting. Mr. Barry asked if the roadway would become a taxable piece of property. Ms. Trucco was not aware of any exemption from property taxes for an HOA. Mr. Staley recalled when the roads were classified as public, there was a possibility of the Sheriff's Department not coming onto Bears Den roads. Ms. Trucco explained that the CDD made efforts to try to distinguish itself from an HOA and staff was trying to make that argument to the Osceola County Sheriff's Department, which she would provide an update to the Board under her report.

On MOTION by Mr. Barry seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor Resolution 2024-03 Conveyance of Real Property Tract to Reunion West Fairways 17 and 18 Association, Inc. was adopted, subject to final execution by the District Engineer.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Staff Reports****A. Attorney**

Ms. Trucco reported that the revised draft of the Traffic Enforcement Agreement with the Osceola County Sheriff's Office (OCSO), was received two days ago and forwarded to the Board. She had not had time to review it, but it appears a nearly new agreement, as many changes were made and once she reviewed it with Ms. Carpenter, comments would be provided back to the County. The majority of revisions, they could live with, but there are some that needed to be clarified. Mr. Staley was happy that there was progress but understood that both Reunion East and West had to agree on the same agreement and questioned how this was facilitated. Ms. Trucco

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****March 14, 2024
Page 6 of 14**

explained that any comments from this Board and the Reunion East CDD Board, would be incorporated, a revised agreement would be sent to OCSO's Legal Department for their comments and it would be brought back to the CDD Boards for approval. However, since Reunion West and Reunion East were separate entities, if one agreement was slightly different than the other, Ms. Trucco did not think that the OCSO would have an issue with it. Mr. Staley preferred to have the same agreement for both entities, since they were all one community. Mr. Greenstein agreed but questioned whether any other CDD entered into a final agreement with a police department. Ms. Adams stated that some Districts managed by GMS in the Central Florida region, entered into agreements with local law enforcement agencies. It was not required, but sometimes law enforcement agencies were more comfortable having an agreement. Ms. Trucco recalled that Lake Ashton II CDD may have a similar agreement with the Winter Haven Police Department. The Sheriff's Department here expressed wanting confirmation of jurisdiction to come in and write tickets, since the roads were owned by the CDD, as well as a request for indemnification, for any damages or lawsuits, due to the negligence of the CDD. For decades, Reunion East and Reunion West, operated without an agreement in place, based in part on the understanding, that the CDD was a government entity with public roads. Mr. Staley congratulated Ms. Trucco on the progress that was made.

Regarding the Security Services Agreement with the Reunion West POA, Ms. Trucco participated in a conference call with Ms. Aura Zelada, the Reunion West POA Manager, their attorney and Ms. Adams. They had some questions and requested a revision about reducing the indemnification obligation of the POA, such as if there was an issue resulting from their contractor or their own negligence, and the CDD was sued, to indemnify or reimburse the CDD up to the limits of their insurance policy. Ms. Trucco did not want this limit in there, because if there was a judgement for \$3 million against the CDD for example, people within CDD boundary could have to pay the difference of the \$2 million if the policy limit was \$1 million, instead of just those in the POA's boundary, as those services are just being provided to those within the POA. It was a productive call and as soon as Ms. Trucco had an update, she would inform the Board. Regarding the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Reunion West POA for the verge areas, revisions were provided to them, since the last Board meeting. However, there were now so many qualifications, that it did not make sense to keep ironing out the agreement and agreed to would keep things status quo between both entities. Mr. Staley pointed out there was no other approach,

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****March 14, 2024
Page 7 of 14**

as the main issue was the responsibility for cleaning the sidewalks. He made the point, that the HOA cleaned sidewalks in Reunion Resort and for consistency, the POA should clean sidewalks outside of residents' homes, which they did not agree with. However, they made so many comments, that the MOU did not make any sense. The meetings were productive and they now had a much better relationship with the POA Board. At this time, this matter was being dropped.

Mr. Greenstein agreed and noted that power washing was covered by the Master Association. Mr. Kingsley was not sure of the arrangement in the Reunion Village. Mr. Staley pointed out that Encore did not clean the sidewalks in Reunion West CDD Encore neighborhood. Mr. Greenstein felt that there should be parallel services in what the POA provided and there should be a budget, in order to put an end to all the CDD versus POA discussions. Mr. Staley agreed, as there should not be inconsistencies, but the POA did not budget for the cleaning of sidewalks and felt that it should be something that Ms. Zelada should discuss with Artemis and the POA Board. For some reason, the POA Board did not want to take on the responsibility of cleaning sidewalks, which Mr. Staley assumed was because their POA fees were high. At this time, they had a good working relationship with the POA and Mr. Staley did not believe they would come back with another draft MOU, as it was not practical. Ms. Trucco agreed and suggested that the Board could consider a formal type of Resolution delegating the responsibility of cleaning the sidewalks to an individual homeowner or associations within the community. Mr. Staley felt there was no need for any such Resolution. Mr. Staley asked if there was any progress on the eminent domain matter. Ms. Trucco indicated that she had not received any notice that an additional offer was made, but would contact Mr. Kent Hip, the head of the Eminent Domain Department. Mr. Barry asked about the inventory of residential lots where the sidewalk installation was pending on vacant lots and asked whether they needed the owner's approval to install the sidewalk. Ms. Trucco stated that they needed to know the parcel and whether it was conveyed to the CDD. Ms. Adams indicated that the assumption was if it was on the right-of-way (ROW), it would be owned by the District, but not every ROW was owned by the CDD so they would need to confirm that the pertinent ROW was owned by the CDD.

Ms. Trucco recommended contacting the owner of the lot, because believed the developer constructed the sidewalk as part of the construction of the home and included the cost with the cost of the home and if the CDD constructed the sidewalk, the developer may object. However, if it was part of the ROW that the CDD owned, the CDD could construct the sidewalk. Mr. Greenstein

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****March 14, 2024
Page 8 of 14**

felt that the builder of the lot should install the sidewalk as for normal lots, the property line ended at the sidewalk, but from the sidewalk down to the driveway, it was owned by the CDD. The CDD had an aggressive program of sidewalk maintenance when there was an intrusion of roots from trees, but for everything else, the sidewalk was the responsibility of the homeowner. However, alley lots and certain other areas are the responsibility of the Association. As far as Mr. Greenstein was concerned the question before the Board was whether to notify the property owner. Mr. Staley understood Mr. Greenstein's notion but if they received permission from the homeowner to install the sidewalk, they must also address who would be responsible to clean it, because the CDD paid to install it. Mr. Greenstein questioned the number of vacant lots, the value, cost and legalities, recalling that in the past, there were many vacant lots when this was previously considered. Now, there were not as many vacant lots. Mr. Barry questioned the difference between getting permission from property owners or informing the property owners. He preferred to inform the resident about sidewalk installation. Ms. Trucco indicated if the CDD wanted to construct a sidewalk in front of a vacant lot and the sidewalk was part of a roadway that was conveyed to or owned by the CDD, the CDD had the legal right to install the sidewalk. However, there were other liability considerations that she would have to look into, such as whether there was an HOA document that required permission and offered to prepare a document listing the liabilities and risks. The first step was to confirm the affected parcels and whether the roadway was conveyed to or owned by the CDD. Ms. Adams confirmed that Mr. Scheerer had not started the inventory and it would be completed before next month's meeting. Mr. Greenstein voiced concern about people with strollers and bicycles going into the roadway in places where there is no sidewalk and wanted to educate people about staying out of the roadway. Mr. Staley requested that the Board think about what they needed to consider such as the liabilities, trip and falls, maintenance and power washing. Ms. Trucco would provide a short one-page bullet point document on the risks and benefits of installing sidewalks at the next meeting.

B. Engineer

Regarding the pavement management bids, Mr. Curley would look into the option of piggybacking on another government contract.

C. Field Manager Updates

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting**

**March 14, 2024
Page 9 of 14**

Mr. Scheerer was not present at the meeting at this time. Ms. Adams introduced Mr. Garrett Huegel, the Onsite Manager with Yellowstone Landscape. Mr. Staley noticed many trees that were cut down in Seven Eagles in the HOA managed properties. Mr. Huegel confirmed that the CDD did not maintain that area and did not remove the trees.

D. District Manager's Report

i. Action Items List

Ms. Adams presented the Action Items List, which was included in the agenda package and reported on the following:

1. Pavement Management & Traffic Calming, Traffic Enforcement Agreement with OC and Update Security Service Provider Agreement: Discussed.
2. Whitemarsh Mound: In Process. The Board approved the work, which would be facilitated by Kingwood Orlando Reunion Resort (KORR), but it was pending due to staffing and equipment issues. It was projected to start as early as next week. Mr. Scheerer was in contact with Mr. Anthony Carll and a pre-construction meeting was scheduled.
3. Amend Parking Rules and Implement: Rule Hearing was held in December and the Towing Service and Security Service Agreements, would need to be amended. Signage was installed. Once the agreements were updated, a courtesy email blast would be sent through the Associations to notify residents that the Parking Rules were updated. Mr. Witcher requested that it be sent to the Approved Builders List in Reunion.
4. Review of Property Ownership in Accordance with Development Plan: Discussed.
5. Inventory of Residential Lots where Sidewalk Installation: Pending. Mr. Scheerer was preparing the inventory and would provide it in advance of the next meeting.
6. Review CDD Property to Determine if a New CDD Amenity can be Constructed in RWCDD Encore Neighborhood: Mr. Scheerer met with the POA Property Manager regarding potential locations and amenities and the Board authorized Mr. Scheerer to proceed with an initial exploration. Once the Reunion West POA Board selected the parcel and amenity, Mr. Scheerer would review on parking and permitting issues.

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting**

**March 14, 2024
Page 10 of 14**

Ms. Adams reported that Mr. Staley provided photographs of a particular parcel, which was being contemplated by the POA for a tennis court, pickleball or playground amenity. Mr. Staley indicated that the parcel was at the corner of Fairfax Drive and Southfield Street, opposite the Clubhouse, POA owned. It was a nice corner lot, opposite of the parking lot. Ms. Adams recalled that the POA was considering three parcels and this was a top contender. Some of the parcels that were reviewed, were owned by the CDD and some by the POA. For reference, a similar scenario existed where there was a License Agreement with Reunion East CDD, where CDD amenities were placed on property owned by another organization, such as the playground and dog park placed on a parcel owned by KORR. Mr. Staley felt that the CDD Board should not get involved with selecting the location. Ms. Adams indicated that the CDD Board would approve the project, the location, and fund it as part of the Repair and Maintenance (R&M) Budget, either as an unbudgeted expense for the current year or for Fiscal Year 2025.

ii. Approval of Check Register

Ms. Adams presented the Check Register from February 1, 2024 through February 29, 2024 in the amount of \$162,352.26, which was included in the agenda package.

On MOTION by Mr. Barry seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor the February Check Register was approved.

iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

Ms. Adams presented the Unaudited Financial Statements through February 29, 2024, which was included in the agenda package and were for informational purposes. No Board action was required. The Truist account balance was lower when compared to previous years because surplus funds were invested in a State Board of Administration (SBA) account, earning about 5.7% interest. When funds were needed for operations, the surplus funds would be moved back to the Truist account.

Mr. Scheerer joined the meeting.

Ms. Adams stated that the Board did a good job of managing expenses, as they were running under budget for the administration of the District. Maintenance and shared expenses were on par with the Prorated Budget. Mr. Staley noted some timing issues, as landscaping was negative. Ms. Adams stated that it was not unexpected to see some bills come in for February that were not

yet received when the unaudited financial were produced; however, there were certain times of the year, where mulch or extra services that were contracted and part of the overall budget, were not evenly split into 12 equal payments; for example, being billed for mulch at the time that the mulch was installed.

iv. Replacement and Maintenance Plan

Ms. Adams presented the Replacement and Maintenance Plan, which was included in the agenda package, that the Board approved as part of the Fiscal Year 2024 budget. Several items were upcoming. The Reunion East CDD Board already approved the roof replacements, but in April, they would be considering proposals for enhanced equipment to replace aged cardio equipment, flooring and other Seven Eagles Fitness Center enhancements, as well as signage for Reunion Village, where the District adopted Parking Rules. Lastly, there were some partition upgrades scheduled in the restrooms at Seven Eagles. Mr. Scheerer recalled that Mr. Staley had questions about some portable generators by the lift station off of Tradition Boulevard, which they were still researching. He reached out to the resort, since it was their landscape company, as well as Toho, since the lift station was maintained by Toho. Mr. Staley pointed out there was an odor, which had been there for two years, due to a failure. Mr. Scheerer confirmed that the smell was off and on. Ms. Adams pointed out that it was not a District asset. Mr. Scheerer indicated that he reached out to Toho as well as Kingwood, in an abundance of caution and as soon as he received an answer, he would provide it to Ms. Adams, so that she could circulate it to the Board. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that it was a continuous problem, which was intermittent once in a while. Regarding the Whitemarsh Mound, Mr. Scheerer reported that all of the utility locates were completed for the removal of the dirt and re-sodding.

v. Approval of Series 2015, 2016, 2017, 2019 and 2022 Arbitrage Rebate Calculation Reports - ADDED

Ms. Adams presented the Arbitrage Rebate Calculation Reports for 2015, 2016, 2017, 2019 and 2022, which were included in the agenda package. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) regulated the tax exempt bonds. Arbitrage reports were required at certain intervals, to show that the bonds were not earning more interest than what the District was paying on the bonds. Based upon the computations, the reports indicated no rebate liability existed and there were no arbitrage issues.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Witcher with all in favor the Series 2015, 2016, 2017, 2019 and 2022 Arbitrage Rebate Calculation Reports were approved.

E. Security Report

Ms. Adams reported that no one from Reunion Security was able to attend this meeting. Security Reports, covering areas served by the Master Association for the Reunion East and Reunion West CDDs, as well as the Reunion West POA for the Reunion West Encore neighborhood, were provided under separate cover. Mr. Staley requested the details of an incident that occurred in Encore, where the security company, put a violation tag on a car at 11:30 p.m., but when the car was still there at 1:30 a.m., the car was towed. Mr. Staley questioned if a vehicle should be towed when people were sleeping. Ms. Adams indicated she had discussion the Reunion West CDD Encore neighborhood POA Manager. While the same Reunion West CDD Parking Rules were in effect throughout the CDD, there were varying approaches to enforcement of the same Rules. There was some level of discretion in the enforcement of the District's Parking Rules. Within the Master Association, served by Reunion Security, when a vehicle is found improperly parked, there is an attempt to contact the vehicle owner, through door knocks and telephone calls, whereas Reunion West POA, served by Curtis Security, did not have any such process to contact the vehicle owner. Any vehicle not parked in accordance with the District's Parking Rules is subject to immediate towing. Some other Districts have towing companies patrolling through the communities and towing vehicles not parked in compliance with District Rules. The CDD is not required to issue a violation notice or provide any type of warning. The security services for the Reunion Master Association, took a different approach to communicate with the vehicle owner. Ms. Adams met with the Reunion West POA Manager, as well as with a Board Member, as they were considering other enforcement strategies. Mr. Staley stated that was their choice, but the Board had the responsibility for Parking Rules. Ms. Adams noted that her office received several calls from guests at Reunion West CDD Encore neighborhood, who were not pleased with the District's Parking Rules. Mr. Staley felt that the POA was aggressively enforcing the rules, and requested that they monitor this, which Ms. Adams understood.

There being no comments, the next item followed.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Supervisor's Requests**

Mr. Barry understood that CDD tree trimming was being performed by Yellowstone and residential tree trimming by the HOA but did not see much tree trimming on the residential side and asked if there were standards, as people were hitting their heads on tree limbs going down the sidewalks. Ms. Adams pointed out that Mr. Kingsley was present to speak on behalf of the Master Association about the landscape standards for tree trimming, but the scope of services for the CDD, required regular tree trimming. At this time, there was structural pruning being undertaken for CDD areas, which was performed about every three years. Mr. Scheerer confirmed the CDD did not do tree trimming in front of homes. Mr. Kingsley would figure out exactly where tree trimming needed to be done, but there was a schedule for residential lots and would get clarification on the strip by the road and how it was defined. Mr. Scheerer recalled that FCC trimmed the street trees on the east side and currently they were in Seven Eagles. Mr. Barry noticed trucks at Twin Eagles Loop were hitting tree limbs and damaging the tree and requested that there be a consistent program. Mr. Kingsley offered to work with the Board, to ensure that the trimming was completed correctly. Mr. Scheerer pointed out at the back of Twin Eagles Loop, there were 10 Japanese Blueberry trees, that the CDD maintained and everything else, between the sidewalk and curb in front of the home lot, would fall within homeowner guidelines or the Master Association. Mr. Greenstein requested discussion of the spec of raising the canopy to the same level as CDD canopies, as a different approach was being taken by the residential side, compared to the commercial side, but there was no reason why there couldn't be the same standard. Ms. Adams thanked Mr. Kingsley for communicating with staff when there were issues, in order to plan and coordinate to the best extent possible. Mr. Staley concurred, as there should be agreement on a common approach, so that there was a standard tree clearance. Mr. Scheerer recalled that the DOT tree clearance requirement was 16 feet on the road and 8 feet on the sidewalk and offered to assist with it.

Mr. Barry recalled discussion at the last meeting, about Kingwood making a presentation to the Board on the conveyance of property for a re-design of the golf club. Ms. Trucco stated there was no update at this time, as they were going to be conferencing with bond trustee's counsel on this matter, but as soon as the legal and engineering review was completed, it would come back to

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting**

**March 14, 2024
Page 14 of 14**

the Board. It was her understanding that Kingwood had a desire to present to the Board, as well as to the Reunion West Board, if there were any impacts. Ms. Adams pointed out when the presentation was ready, the 1:00 p.m. meeting would be noticed as a Reunion West CDD workshop, so Board Members could attend and speak freely.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Meeting Date – April 11th, 2024

Ms. Adams stated that the next meeting was scheduled for April 11, 2024 at 11:00 a.m.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Witcher with all in favor the meeting was adjourned.

DocuSigned by:

Tricia Adams

3F3E5FA5C07E43B...

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

DocuSigned by:

Graham Staley

439F73A503AA4F2...

Chairman/Vice Chairman